

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12-19, 21, 26-29 and 31-33 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 15, 19, 21 and 29 being independent. Claims 1, 4-7, 12-15, 19, 21, 26-29 and 31-33 have been amended. Claims 2, 8-11, 20, 22-25 and 30 were canceled. Support for claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least at pages 1-2 and 6-45.

Claim Rejections under §102(b)

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,279,111 (Jensenworth). For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's attorney has revised claims 1, 4-7, 12-15, 19, 21, 26-29 and 31-33.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a kernel-level transaction system, comprising:

- a memory;
- one or more processors operatively coupled to the memory and disposed within one or more devices;

- a transaction manager disposed within each device, each said transaction manager including a plurality of kernel objects to implement a transaction having plural operations, wherein the plurality of kernel objects include a transaction object to represent a transaction, a resource manager object to represent a resource participating in the transaction, and an enlistment object to enlist participants in the transaction, wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel level; and
- a security descriptor, applied to at least one of the kernel objects, to identify at least one user, to identify one of the operations of the transaction that may be performed on the kernel object to which the security descriptor is applied, and to identify a right indicating that the identified user is permitted or prohibited to perform the operation.

The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 1 is anticipated by Jensenworth. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 1 is amended, as discussed during the interview, to recite that the “kernel-level transaction system” comprises a “plurality of kernel objects” that “include a transaction object to represent a transaction, a resource manager object to represent a resource participating in the transaction, and an

enlistment object to enlist participants in the transaction, wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel level”.

Jensenworth is directed to a security model using “restricted access tokens, each of which are a modified, restricted version of an access token created from an existing (parent) token.” (Column 1, lines 55-57) Jensenworth does not teach “a kernel-level transaction system” that includes “a transaction object...a resource manager object...and an enlistment object...wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel level.”

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Jensenworth. During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to tentatively agree. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

Dependent claims 3-6 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 7 is directed toward a “method of implementing a kernel-level transaction, comprising...security descriptor includes identification for at least one user, an operation that is able to be performed on the at least one kernel object to which the security descriptor is attached, and a right indicating that the identified user is permitted or prohibited to perform the operation, and further wherein the at least one kernel object comprises a transaction object, a resource manager object and/or an enlistment object” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 7 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 7, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 15 is directed toward a “computer-readable medium having stored thereon an object attached to a kernel object, the object comprising...a second data entry identifying an operation capable of being performed on the kernel object by the user identified by the first data entry, wherein the kernel object comprises a transaction object, a resource manager object and/or an enlistment object; and...wherein the object attached to the kernel object is a security descriptor” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 above.

Claims 16-18 depend from independent claim 15 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 15, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 19 is directed toward “a transaction method, comprising...securing the transaction utilizing an operating system security model that applies a security descriptor to at least one of the kernel objects participating in the transaction, wherein the security descriptor includes identification for at least one user, an operation to be performed on the at least one kernel object to which the security descriptor is attached, and a right indicating that the identified user is permitted or prohibited to perform the operation and each of the kernel objects comprise a transaction object, a resource manager object and/or an

enlistment object” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7 and 15.

Independent claim 21 is directed toward “a method of implementing a transaction, comprising: attaching a security descriptor to at least one of a plurality of objects utilized in a transaction, wherein the security descriptor includes identification for at least one user, an operation to be performed on the at least one kernel object to which the security descriptor is attached, and a right indicating that the identified user is permitted or prohibited to perform the operation and each of the kernel objects comprise a transaction object, a resource manager object and/or an enlistment object” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, 15 and 19 above.

Claims 26-28 depend from independent claim 21 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 21, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 29 is directed toward “a kernel-level transaction system, comprising...means for implementing a transaction among kernel objects, wherein the kernel objects include a transaction object to represent a transaction, a resource manager object to represent a resource participating in the transaction, and an enlistment object to enlist participants in the transaction, wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel level” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, 15, 19 and 21 above.

Claims 31-33 depend from independent claim 29 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 29, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,

Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2008

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 324-9256 ext. 238

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265